

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virguis 22313-1450

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,161	01/19/2001	Michael S. Colman	MCA-538	9144
7590 05/24/2005			EXAMINER	
Kevin S. Lemack			MENON, KRISHNAN S	
Nields & Lemac	ck			<u> </u>
Suite 8			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
176 E. Main Street			1723	
Westboro, MA	01581		D	_

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/766,161	COLMAN, MICHAEL S.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Krishnan S. Menon	1723
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pee - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r reply within the statutory minimum of thin riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u>6 December 2004</u> .	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex part</i> e <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)	drawn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	ninor	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ :		by the Examiner
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Application/Control Number: 09/766,161

Art Unit: 1723

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are pending as of the RCE of 8/11/04

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- Claims 1-3 and 5-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by
 "Multiscreen PCR Plates User Guide", Millipore Corp., 4/2000. (IDS of 12/16/04)
 (Henceforth: User Guide).

User guide teaches improved recovery of double-stranded DNA of fragment lengths less than 300 base-pairs using the Multiscreen-384-plate filter (same filter used by applicant in the examples), with 1/5th dilution and with constant pressure differential of about 10 inches of mercury. The dilution agent is water or TE buffer. User guide does not specifically teach fragments of 300 base pairs, but this is inherent in the PCR products and the use of the Multiscreen-384-plate. Under the principles of inherency, if a prior art device, in its normal and usual operation, would necessarily perform the method claimed, then the method claimed will be considered to be anticipated by the

Art Unit: 1723

prior art device. When the prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed the device will inherently perform the claimed process. In re King, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986)

2. Claims 1,3,5-8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 01/19482.

WO'482 teaches a process for the improved recovery of double-stranded DNA by diluting the sample with water and then subjecting it to constant pressure filtration at a first and then a second pressure – page 5, lines 7-19; page 10 lines 10-30.. About the DNA having less than 300 base pairs, see page 2 lines 1-2 (nucleotide is the same as base pair). Re filtering the sample to dryness, this is implied because the filtration is conducted to remove all contaminants, which includes water (page 5 lines 30-32). Also see wells appear empty – page 10 lines 20-22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/766,161 Page 4

Art Unit: 1723

3. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 'User Guide' in view of "Use of Multiscreen Plates for the preparation of bacterial DNA suitable for PCR ("Use of Multiscreen").

User guide teaches improved recovery of double-stranded DNA of fragment lengths less than 300 base-pairs using the Multiscreen-384-plate filter (same filter used by applicant in the examples), with 1/5th dilution and with constant pressure differential of about 10 inches of mercury. The dilution agent is water or TE buffer. User guide does not specifically teach fragments of 300 base pairs, but this is inherent in the PCR products and the use of the Multiscreen-384-plate (In re King). Instant claims differ from the teaching of User Guide in the 'increasing the concentration of said contaminants by adding ... monovalent cations'. Use of Multiscreen teaches adding monovalent and divalent cations (Mg for example) for recovering DNA as a routine procedure (page 283). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of 'Use of Multiscreen' in the teaching of User Guide to increase the recovery of DNA fragments as taught by 'Use of Multiscreen'.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the instant claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1723

This action is in response to an RCE and is made non-final because of the new grounds for rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Krishnan S. Menon-Patent Examiner

5/19/05